

Dear Jon,

9/4/74

While in the rumor a friend sent it appears that two stories are both from the Berkeley Barb 8/16-22, perhaps your piece published under the head "Ford's View of Kennedy's Death" is from another source. Part of it interest me.

First the other piece, by Steve Long about one Harvey Kazijian.

This is frightful stuff typical of frightful people who are commercializing this thing and abusing the current college generation as has never been done before. It is terrible stuff, manufactured for a market that is being bled. These guys must be raking in real loot. I think because they are so utterly indifferent to what they say and because they need to stay so busy making these kinds of pitches for what I heard is \$800 each there just might be a story in it. It is a terrible and deliberate exploitation. I know because this same Kazijian once phoned me prior to his making of U of Mi. speech and I destroyed his whole line to him in a two-hour conversation. He thanked me profusely for setting him straight and then proceeded to make precisely same speech he always makes, as I was told by one in the audience.

Later I got a clipping from another Chicago-area appearance. Same swell.

Some of this improvisation is based on a corruption of my work. The so-called "No Name Key group," for example. It was not a single "group" and it was not a "CIA sponsored covert action operation." It was swashbucklers on their own when there was no official sponsorship. They were arrested by the locals. They were arrested by the feds. They never did anything except play games, like boys.

Do you think that if Garrison really had a real confession Santana or any other would have ever left durante villa?

Do you really think all of Watergate was a decade earlier involved in this "No Name Key group" which did nothing and could do nothing and was a minor collection of tiny, squabbling factions? (I've the leaders of two on taped interviews.)

Your (285') piece on that January 1964 piece is close in spirit but wrong in fact as you will soon learn. Because of the nature of several of the errors and the content of one I would like to know your source or sources if this does not involve confidence.

Those documents were not "since donated to the National Archives." It was the known-in-advance and customary final depository. It set up the original files and provided the file clerks. The files were transferred automatically once the Commission ended its life.

It is utterly false that there is no reference to this allegedly single January secret meeting and that it does not exist. I'd appreciate your silence until the book is out for a number of reasons, one of which is that worthwhile subsidiary use is under consideration, another mechanical delays, etc., but this is the transcript I've been working to get for eight years and have and am publishing in facsimile.

There also is no such "index card." However, this clearly relates to something that was stolen from me, that requires more work, so I'm quite interested in how you freedved the garbled account. It is also factually incorrect to say of that other session "that the minutes of the January 1964 meeting were intentionally destroyed by the Commission." Sometime we'll meet and I'll tell you the full story. My interest here is in what is going on behind the scenes and who is doing it. It can't serve good purposes and can do some harm. There is always the chance that some well-intentioned unknowing is spreading a distorted version of a rumor but I'd prefer not to avoid other possibilities, particularly with this obvious timing. There are a number of these little things on which I find the coincidence provocative.

There is afford angle, not what you indicate. If it is not of interest where I've made the offer that is under consideration - and I do not expect it to be - I am willing for you to use it but I'll have to ask my associate. In fact, there are two offers, both to those who reach great numbers of people. If either is rejected I should really seek other mass outlets because as many people as possible should be reached. But I think the Ford stuff is too hot. Were there the chance the truth not the fiction only could make "a political casualty" of Ford - who happens to have been the ~~one~~ Commissioner ~~not~~ at the session involved... And thus you can evaluate your source as I'd like to for different reasons. Believe me you will see all of this and more. It is far less than I have but the rest can be definitive as it now is not hence my desire for no further misuses, which encourages destructions.